Applicant Appl. No. Examiner Songxiang Wei 09/835,086 Ismail, Shawisaif 16440.4013

Docket No. : 1644

Remarks

Claims 25-37 are pending in the application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the following remarks.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 25-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Boss et al. (U.S. 5,758,110) and in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 25 is patentable because neither Boss nor the AAPA, either alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest "monitoring function calls made by the shared application to dynamically determine a position and a size of a non-DirectDraw region of a window displayed in a presenter screen for a shared application" (emphasis added). The sensor application 107 of Boss detects calls made by the graphical device interface 102 to the display drive 104, and not function calls made by the shared application as required by claim 25 (see column 4, lines 49-58). Figure 3 of Boss clearly shows the sensor application 107 monitoring calls from the graphical user interface (GDI) 102 and the display driver 104 rather than function calls from the shared application. The AAPA does not disclose, teach or suggest this deficiency in Boss.

Further, neither Boss nor the AAPA, either alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest determining the size and position of <u>both</u> a non-DirectDraw region and a DirectDraw region of the window for the shared application. Boss does not teach determining the size and position of <u>two different graphics regions</u> of the window for the shared application, much less a non-DirectDraw region and a DirectDraw region of the window for the shared application. The AAPA does not disclose, teach or suggest this deficiency in Boss.

Further, neither Boss nor the AAPA, either alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest determining the position and size of the DirectDraw region by monitoring a DirectDraw COM interface. Applicant has discovered that the position and size of a DirectDraw region can be determined by monitoring the DirectDraw COM interface instead of monitoring function calls made by the application directly to DirectDraw. The AAPA does not disclose, teach or suggest

Applicant Appl. No. Examiner

Songxiang Wei 09/835,086 Ismail, Shawisaif

Docket No.

16440.4013

determining the position and size of a DirectDraw region by monitoring a DirectDraw COM interface, and Boss only teaches monitoring function calls made by a graphical user interface (GDI), which is not COM based.

For these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 25 is patentable over the combined teachings of Boss and the AAPA, and requests that the rejection of claim 25 be withdrawn.

Claims 26-30 depend from claim 25, and are therefore patentable for the reasons given for claim 25.

Independent claims 31 and 37 each have claim limitations similar to those of claim 25, and are therefore patentable for the reasons given above for claim 25. Claims 32-36 depend from claim 31, and are therefore patentable for at least the reasons given for claim 31.

Conclusion

Prompt and favorable action on the merits of the claims is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, the undersigned can be reached at (949) 567-6700.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee which may be required in connection with this Amendment to deposit account No. 15-0665.

Respectfully submitted,

ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP

Dated: January 17, 2006

oseph K. Liu

Reg. No. 51,957

Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP 4 Park Plaza, Suite 1600 Irvine, CA 92614-2558

Tel. 949-567-6700 Fax: 949-567-6710